Dear Paul, Your 4/26/79 5/7/79

You may not have noticed that I avoided some ~~interpretik~~ interpretations in sending you the Newark FBI ~~MXXX~~ Delgado pages but I did avoid it. I'm gratified with your letter because we are entirely in accord on interpretation and the interpretations are entirely independent.

~~XXXX~~ You do not recall O in NO clearly. If you did you'd have recalled that your and my present interpretations of the visitors LHO had while on guard duty at Santa Ana are precisely those of that early writing of mine, what I saw then in Delgado's questioning by Liebeler and his responses.

My recollection of the Delgado deposition is not nearly that clear.

Rae was here briefly this morning and I asked her if she'd like such a research project with some "outside" reading. Her face lit up. This is the last week of exams. Once they and graduation are over she'll start. If you have any more suggestions, please make them. Those you provide are quite helpful and they do lay out the ~~purpose~~ initial approach.

By the way, if you can have it done cheaply and clearly I think it would be good if I had a clear xerox of Oswald in New Orleans for Rae to mark up her own wany as she reads. It can't be in time for the immediate but maybe she should read all of it. If so and particularly because there may be other need, like my rereading it, perhaps two copies. If any problem I'll ask JL about DC.

In this connection it is becoming increasingly clear to me that much of the stuff the FBI did not want on paper was handled by phone. I've found some records where the SAC's covered their asses rather than the Bureau's. So I think NK was told the scoop, by phone.

I believe that I also went into Delgado being leaned on to change his story. O in NO.

Aside from the possible explanation on which we both agree and on which I could not have been more explicit - it could not have been Cuban diplomats who went to see LHO - there is another possibility you should not loose sight of: the FBI's determination to have NO conspiracy, npt even Castroite. I do not recit this explanation but it is not an impossible FBI attitude if anyone outside NK saw what Delgado actually did say.

No Archives check is now possible for me so I canet have Rae review any of those records I do not have.

For now I'd rather not have you share this with Peter Dale Scott. My desire is not of literary motivation. Rather is it that I do not want his to me farout interpretations being made in public or influencing your independent judgement. He is bright and able but he has started too many mythologies for me and I found found some of his supposedly factual interpretations - let me say stretched - to suit political preconcepptions.

For this we want factual,knowledge, not political interpretayions.

I also do not want to flag this interest and I will be seeking other relevant records. Remember, I got none of this in the Dallas files and that is a case in court. I have some appeals possibilities.

What eventuates will later determine whether I will want to hold back for writing. While as of now I doubt it I do reserve it. Remember, you are the only (living) one with whom I have shared my work on the possibility of Oswald as somebody's somekind of agent.

I'm making a copy of this and of your letter for Rae, who presides over the basement and oes most of her work there. She may have some ideas when she reads and reviews and I may have others later. This is off the top of the head, as I'm resting on a break. I'm pacing myself while combining necessary outside work with necessary exercise and trying to avoid the always uncertain overdoing it.

I'll be writing about the other enclosures on the next break. Here I want to add that I'M glad to know that HSCA did not back out on the agreement to include my memo. Here is the story behind it and on this no restrictions.

John Ray wanted me with him. Jim and the sister, Carol Pepper, both said more than he wanted Jim but I doubt this. They all have the highest regard for Jim.

Anyway, John's appearance coincided with two speeches in a single week that the lecture bureau had lined up for me. Initially it was to be the morning after the second one then they, happily, delayed it for a day. This meant that I had much of a day and much more importantly, a night in DC before the testimony. We got the press kit the end of the working day, made two copies at Jim's office and returned to the US Marshal's jail with one for John at suppertime, the earliest possible moment, the HSCA got it to Jim that late. Jim had made a reservation for me at a motel not far from his home and the Capitol and we separated, he to ponder and prepare for his legal problems and I to see what I could do with (alleged) fact.

As a non-subject expert and as a reading on all others, maloderously AIB in particular, you should understand that none of the HSCA's Ray conspiracy theorizing is within any degree, no matter how remote, of possibility. It is totally impossible, as I'M sure JL will agree. It is necessary to understand this and that the FBI boobytrapped HSCA with the Byers hit, which I forced out as much as is out. He was flushing a fink and he succeeded. The FBI was giving the HSCA a mechanical rabbit and it never saw a real one.

As soon as I got into the alleged evidence I phoned Jim about it and told him it was all false. I believe this accounts for the HSCA's open hostility and determination not to let Jim get a word in edgewise. It also accounts for what others may be unaware of, the very considerable pressure the combination put him under.

However, I was under no such pressures and as you know have not given a dmen about the committee from Sprague's day. I knew and saw what others were unwilling to see.

So I could more or less think ahead and do some of Jim's thinking for him. I did not have immediate considerations forcing almost all else out of my mind as Jim did. He had a very bad situation because they had already tossed John Ray back in jail and had and to this day continue to have the determination to repeat it. Jim had to keep John out of jail as a result of that testimony, in addition to facing other problems.

I could keep nudging him on this point or that and often did, without bothering to cover the mikes. I thus kept him after Fauntroy when his beautiful explosion forced Stokes out of the chair. The HSCA was not about to force a showdown with us after Jim did what he does not do often enough (with much provocation), got real mad. By then the record was one on which only a McCarthy would have dared stand.

Fauntroy also is his own kind of pecimen as well as having th try to save the committee's face. So we got permission to file a response, with records attached, and their promise to give us what they had not disclosed, a promise not kept except where we could forced it at the hearing. Thus I could draw on only a little of what was not in the press kit.

Then HSCA had its own dirty tricks to play, first delaying any copy of the transcript and then giving Jim only the pages on which he spoke. John's, sent to the wrong address and thus additionally delayed, consisted on those pages on which he spoke only. I got both sets, made a combined set and still did not have a complete set. By then the comittee's time permission had expired so I ignored it and went ahead and did what was possible, with both Jim and me already overwhelmed with inpcourt HOOA work.

I did a draft once I had everything I did get and did just had time to retype the rought draft, finishing it I believe the night before the committee's last day, with the Weiss-Ashmanay testimony. I went to DC with it, met Jim at the hearing and he gave it to Stokes, by hand, at the end of the a.m. session. I have not yet had time to read it! As of last night Jim did not know that it was being used and we talked about steps if it was not included in the published record. (Privately, for you alone, I did get a copy to someone at Justice, who passed it along to others, because the committee did again press for prosecution. Withthat evidence I'm sure DJ will stall and then forget because it would be utterly ruinous to DJ in court and I'M sure the St. Louis prosecutor, if not also DC, would refuse any such case. In addition, Blakey, your respected, lied to the FBI about the basis for the perjury charge and actually gave DJ no proofs at all-nothigng not verbal except the John ex. sess. transcript.)...I was limited to John and what was available but I think there will not now be further obfuscation by more phoney charges in the King case. I think John won't be charged. Except for the media blitz that asject is past, I think.